



Setti D. Warren
Mayor

City of Newton, Massachusetts
Department of Planning and Development
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone
(617) 796-1120
Telefax
(617) 796-1142
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089
www.newtonma.gov

Candace Havens
Director

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS
NEWTON UPPER FALLS HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

DATE: March 13, 2014

PLACE/TIME: City Hall, Room 202
7:30 p.m.

ATTENDING: Larry Schwirian, Chairman
Jeff Riklin, Member
Jay Walter, Member
Paul Snyder, Member
Laurie Malcom, Alternate
Stephen Pantalone, Staff
See Attendance List

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm with Larry Schwirian serving as Chairman. Voting permanent members were Schwirian, Riklin, Walter, and Snyder. Malcom voted in place of Der Hohannesian. Stephen Pantalone acted as recording secretary and the meeting was digitally recorded on an H2 Zoom recording device.

1044-1046 Chestnut Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Eric Bernard, owner of this property, presented his plans to replace the existing front seven stairs, including the front four stairs to the top of the stone wall and the three stairs from the landing to the front door. The owner noted that the three stairs to the front door are being replaced as part of the previously approved front veranda project. The existing stairs consist of masonry construction with red brick risers and blue stone tread, and will be replaced with granite risers and tread, and a rough finish. The landing between the bottom and top stairs will be rebuilt using the same blue stone material.

Materials presented at the meeting:
Photos of the stairs

Walter motioned to accept this proposal for the stairs as presented and described. Riklin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

36-38 High Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Chris Murphy, owner of this property, presented his plans to replace four doors on the front of the house with new fiberglass doors with panels. Walter noted that the handout showed white muntin whereas another picture showed a darker muntin, and that the darker muntin is more appropriate. Malcom asked why the Commission wouldn't ask the petitioner to use a plywood material for the doors to match the existing doors. Walter responded that the plywood doors are not original to the house and therefore not historic. Walter also noted that the Commission typically views fiberglass as a suitable alternative because it looks like wood and is superior in terms of its thermal qualities. Walter raised a concern about the panels on the doors because sometimes fiberglass doors use artificial snap-on panels. The owner confirmed that the panels on the proposed doors are simulated divided light windows.

Materials presented at the meeting:

Photos of the front of the house

Example of proposed doors

Schwirian motioned to accept this proposal for the doors as presented and described. Snyder seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

72 Cottage Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Representatives from the owner of the property (Emerald Green Development, LLC), including, Delince Louis, Aaron Breen, and Marina Hauser, presented their plan for a gut rehabilitation of the existing two-family house. Malcom questioned whether the property had been sold in December, based on Redfin and Google listings. Mr. Louis confirmed that the property was not sold. Mr. Louis walked the Commission through the proposed work, which included new siding, roofing, dormers, windows, entrances, decks, porches, skylights and basement bulkhead, as well as significant interior work. The proposed work would create two side by side units. Mr. Louis noted that the building is currently in very poor shape.

A discussion of the overall design of the building ensued. Walter noted that the proposed design is turning a very non-symmetrical building into a completely symmetrical building, and is therefore changing the character or look of the building. The rest of the Commission generally agreed with this comment and suggested that they change the symmetry of the building by making adjustments to the fenestration. As an example, Walter suggested moving the dormers and windows around or altering their size. Mr. Louis indicated that dormers were placed in certain locations for zoning and structural reasons and because they are two identical units, but was generally open to further exploring the Commission's suggestions. Malcom noted that the purpose of the Commission is to make sure that the historical features are retained, and Walter reiterated that mimicking the previous look does not mean the design has to be identical to the existing structure.

Riklin began discussing the materials in the proposed plan and a discussion ensued on the material preferred by the Commission. The Commission and Mr. Louis preliminarily agreed that the following materials would be used:

- Hardiplank siding,
- clad, or aluminum clad two over two vertical windows with simulated or actual divided light, definitely no vinyl, windows may include a florange casing around window,
- new asphalt shingle roof (Riklin visited the site and believes that very little of the existing roof is salvageable),
- new square wood lattice below the new porch,
- two glass skylights on roof (located above the staircase),
- fiberglass doors,
- fir or other natural material for railings,
- fiberglass or fir gutters,
- aluminum downspout,
- composite or PVC cornerboard.

There was additional discussion of the plans, as it appeared that the Commission members did not have all of the elevations. Staff passed around copies of the missing elevations at the meeting. Riklin also noted that right side elevation in the plans is actually the left side elevation, which should be corrected upon resubmittal.

Nina Koch who lives at 70 Cottage Street was attending the meeting to learn more about this project. Ms. Koch asked a question about the depth of the decks, which Mr. Louis answered as eight feet. Ms. Koch was generally in favor of the project for now and noted the poor shape of the existing building

Materials presented at the meeting:

Photos of house

Site plan, elevation drawings

Mr. Louis requested that the Board not vote on the project at the meeting to allow them time to revise the drawings based on the changes suggested by the Board. Malcom motioned to accept the proposal to allow the applicant to continue the meeting until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Walter seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

22 Winter Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Jack Foster, owner of the property, and Elan Laver, the architect on the project, presented plans to renovate the façade of the building including adding new shed dormers on the second story, adding and moving existing windows, replacing clapboard siding and the asphalt shingle roof. Mr. Foster indicated that the City of Newton allowed them to locate a residential unit above the existing commercial unit, and that adding dormers to the second story would allow for a more livable space.

Schwirian described a letter from Board Member Donald Lang, who was unable to attend the meeting, which suggested modifying the proposed shed dormers to be gabled dormers. There was a discussion of whether shed dormers or gable dormers were more appropriate. Most of the Commission members at the meeting felt that shed dormers were actually more appropriate based on the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Foster and Mr. Laver did not feel strongly about the type of dormer, except that they prefer the dormer that provides the most space. They explained

that their choice of a shed dormer was based on similar projects and existing structures in the surrounding neighborhood. Several Commission members agreed that shed dormers were more common. Walter also felt that shed dormers would work better based on the width of the roof, and Schwirian felt that shed dormers would improve livability.

Riklin began a discussion of materials, beginning with the windows, for which he proposed changing from nine over nine to either six over six, or two over two vertical. Riklin also suggested removing the octagonal windows or changing them to a rectangular/square window. Mr. Foster and Mr. Laver were agreeable to the change in both cases. There was additional discussion of alternatives to the octagonal windows, which include square dead windows, awning windows, and one over one. Mr. Laver noted that one octagonal is over the stairway and one is in a bathroom. Schwirian stated that if the owner chooses to put gutters on the roof that they should be fiberglass. Discussion of the drainage on the site ensued. Mr. Laver confirmed that the siding would be wood clapboard to match the existing and that shingle roofing would be replaced.

Walter asked a question about the inset under the building, which led to a discussion of its historic importance and the two doors within the inset. Mr. Laver indicated that doors enter the same room and asked the Commission what could be done with the inset and the doors. The Commission members noted that inset was part of the look of the building and had to remain, including the width of the existing doorway. The Commission noted that material of the doors could be changed to a certain point if the applicant wanted, but did not want to see sidelights. A final plan for the doors within the inset was not reached, however the owner appeared to understand the historic limitations.

Schwirian began a discussion on the lower level basement area, which is not viewable from a public way. A discussion of the stair area to the lower level ensued. The discussion of the project ended with the Commission requesting that additional exterior material details be further delineated in the drawings and that the existing elevations are included in the plans.

Materials presented at the meeting:

Photos of house

Site plan, elevation drawings

The Commission asked the owner if he would be willing to continue the hearing until the next regularly scheduled meeting, so that they could review revised plans. Snyder motioned to allow the applicant to continue the meeting until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Walter seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

82-84 High Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Rich Gordon, owner of the property, presented his plans to renovate one single-family and one two-family dwelling. Mr. Gordon explained that the renovations consisted mostly of an interior gut rehabilitation, but included some exterior changes to the existing structures and materials, including removing and/or rebuilding outside porches and removing the chimney on single-family house.

Walter asked for clarification on the removal of the chimney on the single family house, and Board concluded that the chimney was part of the look of the building. Mr. Gordon indicated that

it was not structurally sound and that he would agree to repair instead of removing it. Mr. Gordon also confirmed that the chimney on the two-family house would be abandoned but not removed. Schwirian asked about the heating system and the applicant indicated that it was gas forced hot air and that all systems are being renovated.

Walter asked a question about the change over from clapboard to shingle siding and what appeared to be a band separating the two materials. The applicant indicated that the band was an error in the drawings. Jay indicated that as long as the band was a darker color there was not issue with it, but that they should be sure to maintain the current crossover between shingle and clapboard. Mr. Gordon suggested a neutral color that would soften the crossover. Mr. Gordon also asked if they're generally allowed to use Azek, which the Commission confirmed. A discussion of the siding on the two-family dwelling ensued, which concluded with the Commission suggesting keeping the clapboard instead of switching to shingle.

Several Commission members raised questions about materials. A discussion ensued and Mr. Gordon confirmed the following;

- proposed shutters should be removed from the plan, as they are not appropriate for the neighborhood
- the windows on the two-family should be two over two vertical
- downspouts should be fir or treated fiberglass, and not vinyl, as proposed in the rear elevation
- proposed Asek cornerboards, should be 5/4x5 by 5/4x6
- fir or wood product for railings with or treks tread.
- fiberglass patio doors
- wood shingle siding on the second floor of the single-family dwelling, including in the rear of the building
- asphalt roof on the single-family dwelling and a rubber roof on the two-family dwelling

Riklin questioned the type material for the decorative brackets holding up roof overhangs, and noted that other properties in the neighborhood used a wood material. Mr. Gordon did not know the type of material but indicated he would find the answer for staff and the Commission. Walter asked the owner to take out the rafter tails. Malcolm asked about the square footage of the units and whether it would be reduced after all of the interior work. Mr. Gordon responded that he didn't know the proposed FAR and by how much it changed, but expected the same square footage if not more. Mr. Gordon also noted that the roof height will increase by approximately a foot because they need to raise/build up the foundation.

Betsy Hewitt, of One Winter Street, asked the owner about parking on the site, and noted the difficult parking situation on High Street. A discussion of parking ensued, during which, Mr. Gordon stated that he was not changing the existing parking and a maximum of five parking spaces fit on the site. Mr. Gordon indicated that tenants would be responsible for finding additional parking, as necessary. There was a discussion of the conditions in the rear of the site, and it appeared that there was a disagreement between Ms. Huard and Mr. Gordon on this matter. Since the parking is in the rear of the house and not visible from the street it was not a significant concern of the Commission. The Commission also noted that if the owner cannot provide parking, the issue will be raised during the building permit process. Mr. Gordon indicated that the parking areas were gravel, and that he had no intention of paving them in the future, and

that if changes were necessary he would use additional gravel or grass pavers. Ms. Huard also raised a concern about the condition of the existing fence, and Mr. Gordon replied that he would look at the fence and replace it if necessary. The Commission required that any replacement fence be of a wood material, but not a stockade fence. Ms. Huard then asked the owner about drainage on the site and runoff, noting that 7 Winter Street has water problems in their basement. A brief discussion of the roof material and gutters ensued. Mr. Gordon indicated that the roofing will be replaced with the same material as the existing roof, and that he was aware of some of the water issues. Drainage is outside of the purview of the Commission. The owner of 83 High Street was also in attendance and raised similar concerns in regards to parking. Both of the neighbors in attendance were pleased that the property would be renovated.

Materials presented at the meeting:

Photos of house

Site plan, elevation drawings

Schwirian asked the applicant if he would be willing to come back to the next Commission meeting. Mr. Gordon responded that he would like to begin work. Snyder suggested approving with conditions. Riklin made motion to accept the proposal with the following conditions:

1. the windows are clad two over two vertical;
2. the railing are a wood material and the treads can be trek;
3. the gutters are fir or fiberglass, and have the same contours as traditional gutters;
4. the downspout is aluminum;
5. the owner will correct the rear elevation drawing on the single-family house, to show a shingle material on the second floor;
6. all shutters will be removed;
7. the chimney on the single-family house and two-family house will be kept;
8. the owner will provide further details on the decorative brackets to the city's preservation planner for review and approval;
9. the owner will provide further details on any proposed fencing for review and approval by the city's preservation planner.

Walter seconded the motion and the vote passed unanimously.

Administrative Discussion:

Minutes:

With five members in attendance, minutes from January of 2014 were approved.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Recorded by Stephen Pantalone, Senior Planner

DATE: March 20, 2014

SUBJECT: **1044-1046 Chestnut Street High Street – Certificate of Appropriateness**

At the regularly scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 13, 2014, the Newton Upper Falls
Historic District Commission, by a vote of 5-0:

RESOLVED to accept the proposed design and material specifications for the front stairs and landing
between the front stairs and previously approved porch as presented.

Voting in the Affirmative: Larry Schwirian, Chairman; Paul Snyder, Jay Walter, Jeff Riklin, Laurie
Malcom

Stephen Pantalone, Recording Secretary

DATE: March 20, 2014

SUBJECT: **36-38 Chestnut Street High Street – Certificate of Appropriateness**

At the regularly scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 13, 2014, the Newton Upper Falls
Historic District Commission, by a vote of 5-0:

RESOLVED to accept the proposed design and material specifications for four doors on the front façade of
the building as presented, which included dark colored muntins and windows with simulated or actual
divided light.

Voting in the Affirmative: Larry Schwirian, Chairman; Paul Snyder, Jay Walter, Jeff Riklin, Laurie
Malcom

Stephen Pantalone, Recording Secretary

DATE: March 20, 2014

SUBJECT: **82-84 High Street – Certificate of Appropriateness**

At the regularly scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 13, 2014, the Newton Upper Falls Historic District Commission, by a vote of 5-0:

RESOLVED to accept this proposed design, accept that all proposed shutters shall be removed from the plan elevations and all chimneys shall be repaired and abandoned; and the proposed material specifications with the following changes: the windows shall be clad two over two vertical; the railing shall be a wood material and treads may be trek; the gutters shall be fir or fiberglass, and shall have the same contours as traditional gutters; the downspout shall be aluminum; the siding on the second floor of single-family dwelling shall be shingle from all elevations. Furthermore, additional details on the proposed decorative brackets and any replacement of fencing shall be provided to the City's Preservation Planner for review and approval.

Voting in the Affirmative: Larry Schwirian, Chairman; Paul Snyder, Jay Walter, Jeff Riklin, Laurie Malcom

Stephen Pantalone, Recording Secretary

DATE: March 20, 2014

SUBJECT: **22 Winter Street** – Certificate of Appropriateness

At the regularly scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 13, 2014, the Newton Upper Falls Historic District Commission, by a vote of 5-0,

RESOLVED to approve the rudimentary plans for addition of shed dormers and windows, and with the condition that final approval will be subject to submission of more detailed drawings of the project. Approval of all architectural details and materials will be reviewed at a future regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission.

Voting in the Affirmative: Larry Schwirian, Chairman; Paul Snyder, Jay Walter, Jeff Riklin, Laurie Malcom

Katy Holmes, Recording Secretary

DATE: March 20, 2014

SUBJECT: **72 Cottage Street** – Certificate of Appropriateness

At the regularly scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 13, 2014, the Newton Upper Falls Historic District Commission, by a vote of 5-0,

RESOLVED to continue the review of the proposed project at a future regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission, and to revise the plans to reflect the architectural symmetry and design of the existing structure, and to show all proposed materials.

Voting in the Affirmative: Larry Schwirian, Chairman; Paul Snyder, Jay Walter, Jeff Riklin, Laurie Malcom

Katy Holmes, Recording Secretary